SUMMARY OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD MEETING MAY 24, 2001

The Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board (ELAB) met on Thursday, May 24, 2001, at 2:00 p.m. Mountain Daylight Time (MDT) during the Seventh NELAC Annual Meeting in Salt Lake City, UT. The meeting was led by its chair, Dr. Wilson Hershey of Lancaster Laboratories, Inc. A list of action items is given in Attachment A. A list of participants is given in Attachment B. The meeting's agenda is given in Attachment C. Minutes prepared by ELAB for their January 9, March 6, and April 24, 2001 meetings are given in Attachments D, E, and F respectively. *The purpose of the meeting was to address items of importance identified in the meeting agenda.*

INTRODUCTION

The meeting was called to order by ELAB's Designated Federal Officer (DFO), Dr. Steven Billets of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Following an introduction of ELAB members, Dr. Billets noted that ELAB's charter will expire at the end of July 2001. Dr. Billets also noted that the paperwork necessary to recharter the U.S. EPA-sponsored advisory committee established under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) for another two-year term has been completed and is on its way to the agency's Deputy Administrator. He then turned the meeting over to Dr. Hershey, who welcomed attendees and reviewed the meeting agenda. The minutes from ELAB's January 9, March 6, and April 24, 2001 meetings were reviewed. Dr. Hershey noted that ELAB prepared their own minutes for these meetings and that the minutes have not yet been posted on the NELAC Website. He indicated that the minutes from the three meetings would be incorporated into the minutes from this meeting at NELAC 7. The January 9 and April 24 minutes were accepted as written. The March 6 minutes were accepted pending correction of a minor typographical error. The status of action items from the three meetings was also reviewed. Dr. Hershey directed ELAB's attention to the March 6 minutes in which he was asked to invite Mr. Robert Graves (U.S. EPA) and Ms. Reenie Parris (National Institute of Standards and Technology - NIST) to address ELAB on May 24. He explained that Mr. Graves and Ms. Parris had been invited to the meeting but had declined. Dr. Hershey also noted that the three recommendations from ELAB's April 24 meeting were printed on the back of the May 24 meeting agenda. He pointed out that the NELAC Board of Directors (BoD) is already working on the third recommendation, which reads as follows:

> **ELAB recommends that NELAC establish a policy as to when it will develop standards for new testing areas such as source emissions, field sampling, etc. That policy should specify the number of requests necessary from federal agencies or accrediting authorities so that committees have a clear mandate to develop new standards.**

UPDATE ON PROFICIENCY TESTING (PT) ACTIVITIES

Ms. Barbara Burmeister, NELAC PT Committee chair, presented an update on her committee's efforts to identify and solve problems arising since the implementation of the NELAC PT program. She

noted that the committee has been working diligently, holding two face-to-face committee meetings and inviting NELAC stakeholders (laboratories, accrediting authorities, and PT providers) to join them in addressing the issues. Ms. Burmeister summarized the issues as follows:

Resolved

1. Mechanism to fast-track reinstatement after PT failures and expansion of field of accreditation - The NELAC PT Committee proposed changes to the NELAC Standard to accomplish this.

2. Standardization of the PT evaluation report format - The NELAC PT Committee proposed changes to the NELAC Standard to accomplish this.

3. Consistent reporting and scoring of PT data - The NELAC PT Committee developed a list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) to clarify this process. Some inconsistencies exist and will be addressed. The committee will work with the U.S. EPA to revise their National Standards for Water Proficiency Testing Criteria Document.

To Be Addressed Before NELAC 7i

4. Problems with acceptance criteria - The NELAC PT Committee will utilize a PT subcommittee to identify current acceptance limit criteria that don't seem to be working. The NELAC PT Committee will also create a permanent subcommittee of technical experts to evaluate current acceptance criteria and monitor pass/fail performance.

Ongoing Unresolved Issue

5. Need a Proficiency Testing Oversight Body (PTOB) and additional Proficiency Test Provider Accreditors (PTPAs) for analytes beyond NIST's scope of accreditation

Following Ms. Burmeister's presentation, the members of ELAB asked if the NELAC PT Committee needs any assistance from ELAB. Ms. Burmeister responded that the PT Committee does not need assistance at this time contingent upon their ability to create a permanent subcommittee of experts through NELAC. She noted that the PT Committee may need input from ELAB regarding who should serve on the subcommittee. In subsequent discussion of PT issues it was noted that the NELAC PT program is working well with only minor start-up problems. There are significant problems, however, with non-NELAC states in regard to differing state requirements for analytes, PT schedules, etc. These issues of scope and timing increase the number of PT samples that states must analyze. There is no mechanism in NELAC to deal with non-NELAC states. There was significant discussion from the floor in regard to the private sector laboratory's cost to buy PT samples to satisfy NELAC PT requirements, non-NELAC state PT requirements, Department of Defense (DoD) PT requirements, and client PT requirements. There was also discussion of PT failure issues that have nothing to do with normal laboratory data quality issues, such as volume dilution requirements arising from differences between PT samples and realworld samples and clerical data reporting errors. A PT provider made three suggestions as to ways that ELAB can assist in the resolution of these problems:

1. ELAB could make recommendation that a uniform scope of accreditation (especially for NELAC laboratories) be implemented as soon as possible.

2. ELAB could make recommendation that non-NELAC states review NELAC PT program before developing their own programs.

3. ELAB could encourage states to set only PT requirements rather than a fixed timeframe for PT sample analysis.

Considerable discussion ensued in regard to whom ELAB should make such recommendations, how ELAB can provide information to non-NELAC states, and of whether such recommendations fall within the scope of ELAB's charter. There was some interest in preparing a position (white) paper. The issue was taken under advisement for discussion in the one teleconference remaining before the expiration of ELAB's charter.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Performance Based Measurement Systems (PBMS) Subcommittee - Dr. Harry Gearhart, Chair

Dr. Gearhart presented a brief recap of recent ELAB activities on PBMS and a summary of the NELAC Quality Systems Committee PBMS subcommittee work product presented in the Quality Systems Committee meeting on May 22, 2001. Dr. Gearhart reported that ELAB presented the conceptual straw model for PBMS implementation at NELAC 6i. The NELAC Quality Systems Committee then accepted the task of developing a "Standard Implementation Model for PBMS." Following NELAC 6i, the NELAC Quality Systems Committee formed a PBMS subcommittee to integrate PBMS concepts into proposed standard language and to develop a work product for consideration by the Quality Systems Committee. The subcommittee set a tentative deadline for completion of draft revisions of Chapter 5 and supporting Appendices C and D1 for presentation to the Quality Systems Committee as a "work-in-progress" report at NELAC 7. The presentation was intended to facilitate discussion and elicit input from NELAC stakeholders for the benefit of the Quality Systems Committee in moving forward with the work product. Dr. Gearhart summarized the highlights of the subcommittee work product presented on May 22 as follows:

1. PBMS concepts were integrated into the language of Chapter 5 as laboratory practice and policy, virtually eliminating the phrase "performance based measurement system" and its related acronym "PBMS."

2. The client's role was articulated and clarified in Chapter 5.

3. The ELAB straw model concepts of method use, method selection, and method evaluation were carried forward in Chapter 5.

4. Improvements were suggested regarding instrument calibration and methods manual structure.

5. Appendix C described a proposed model for initial method evaluation based on "representative matrices." Various primary source material was referenced.

6. Appendix D detailed ongoing method evaluation steps to determine and document sources of uncertainty relating to actual sample matrices and system influences.

Dr. Gearhart also summarized significant audience comments concerning the work product as follows:

1. There exists a strong sense that a tiered approach, which differentiates between agency-mandated methods and other alternatives, should be considered versus a uniform approach for initial evaluation requirements.
2. The rationale for further modifications to the calibration section was questioned.
3. Clarification was requested on what training exists for the Method Quality Objective (MQO) approach. Mr. David Friedman, U.S. EPA, provided an answer.
4. Method Blank acceptance criteria were questioned.
5. A concern was raised for alternative method selection and the Daubert principles of data admissibility and defensibility. This continues to be an issue of concern, especially to individuals in regulated entities.
6. Mandated method batch quality control (QC) should be preferentially followed.
7. Clarification was requested regarding client approval in the methods selection process. The clarification was provided by Mr. Jerry Parr.
8. Reconsideration of the standard's definition of matrix was recommended.

Dr. Gearhart noted that the subcommittee perceived the following needs for improvement in the model as it currently exists:

1. Revisiting the "matrix type" definition in the NELAC Standard
2. Reevaluation of an appropriate or preferable tiered approach to the initial evaluation
3. Clarification of hierarchy of batch QC requirements in mandated methods
4. Input from persons with expertise in statistics relative to calculation of uncertainty, especially for the initial evaluation process
5. Appropriate incorporation of Analysts Initial Demonstration of Competency in Chapter 5 or elsewhere in the NELAC Standard

In closing Dr. Gearhart summarized several recommendations made to the NELAC Quality Systems Committee as follows:

1. Consider the necessary steps in continuing to revise the NELAC Standard.
2. Provide recurring training for accrediting authority assessors (start at NELAC 8?).

3. Make a deliberate effort to improve communication, both within NELAC and with external stakeholders.

4. Consult with the NELAC Chair to form an implementation subcommittee. (It was acknowledged that the formation of an implementation subcommittee may be outside the scope of the Quality Systems Committee.)

In subsequent discussion of Dr. Gearhart's subcommittee report, Mr. Parr stressed the subcommittee's attempts to eliminate the phrase "performance based measurement system" and its related acronym "PBMS." He suggested that ELAB encourage NELAC committees to remove the phrase from their chapters. It was also noted that the integration of International Organization for Standardization (ISO) Document 17025 into Chapter 5 is occurring as a parallel activity. It will be necessary to revisit Chapter 5 in regard to PBMS after the integration of ISO 17025. It was suggested that the subcommittee has served its purpose to generate discussion of the issue. The ELAB PBMS subcommittee is now inactive.

Air Source Emission Task Team (ASETT) - Dr. Allen Verstuyft, Chair

Dr. Verstuyft reviewed the first two recommendations printed on the back of the May 24, 2001 meeting agenda as follows:

> **ELAB recommends that NELAC delay adoption of accreditation standards for stack testing for two years. ELAB recognizes the Field Activities Committee's concern for the quality of source testing and reporting data. In lieu of accreditation under the NELAC process, the states and EPA are, of course, free to promulgate regulations as they deem appropriate.**
>
> **ELAB recommends that ASETT and the Measurement of Source Emissions (MSE) Subcommittee be disbanded as subcommittees of ELAB and the NELAC Field Activities Committee, respectively.**

Dr. Verstuyft explained that the two recommendations had been discussed in ELAB's March 6 and April 24, 2001 teleconferences. He also noted that the Source Evaluation Society, the state of Louisiana, and the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Committee D2 have expressed an interest in examining the stack testing issue during the two-year delay in adoption of stack testing standards. There was minimal additional discussion of the issue from ELAB or the floor.

METHODS AND DATA COMPARABILITY BOARD (MDCB) RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Parr explained that the MDCB is a FACA committee focused on ambient water quality monitoring. MDCB's membership draws heavily from state and federal agencies with major participation from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and U.S. EPA. Mr. Parr indicated that he has two goals concerning MDCB. He would like to see ELAB investigate synergy with MDCB so that the two committees can

work together toward common goals. He would also like to see ELAB endorse the four recommendations set forth in MDCB's white paper on the accreditation of federal laboratories for water quality and monitoring. The recommendations outlined in the white paper's executive summary are as follows:

1. All federal laboratories (and commercial laboratories employed by federal agencies) performing analytical water testing, as part of compliance or ambient monitoring programs, should be accredited under a recognized program, in order to better establish comparability of data.
2. The National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (NELAP) is the MDCB's recommended program, because NELAP adequately meets (or is taking measures to meet) the broad needs of the majority of federal laboratories performing water testing.
3. For NELAP to serve as a satisfactory accrediting program for federal laboratories, NELAP needs to continue its efforts to:
    - Obtain more state participation and reciprocity
    - Address standards for ambient monitoring, field sample collection, and field measurements
    - Promote the development of PBMS implementation
4. Federal agencies should consider seeking to become an accrediting authority for their own laboratories under NELAP.

When the issue was opened to discussion from the floor, it was noted that recommendation #3 has already been accomplished by ELAB. There were several suggestions about combining the remaining recommendations into one recommendation. In response a representative from one of the federal agencies in attendance urged ELAB to delay endorsing recommendation four. Noting that most federal laboratory work has been privatized and that few federal agencies are performing their own laboratory work, she suggested that it would be resource-intensive and a waste of time for all agencies other than U.S. EPA to become accrediting authorities in order to accredit their own laboratories. It was generally agreed that the time is right for integration between ELAB and MDCB. An attendee directed ELAB's attention to the portion of the white paper that mentions ELAB specifically and provides a list of topics about which MDCB and ELAB should be communicating. There was discussion of interaction between the two FACA committees with the suggestion that either a member common to both or one member from each should act as liaison(s). After moderate discussion, it was suggested that Mr. Parr serve as ELAB liaison to MDCB and that Dr. Barton Simmons of the California EPA serve as MDCB liaison to ELAB. Mr. Parr and Dr. Simmons indicated their willingness to serve in this capacity. Since at least one member of ELAB requested additional time to review the MDCB's white paper, it was decided that ELAB would consider this idea at their next teleconference. After considerable discussion, Mr. Parr indicated that he would customize specific issues of overlap between ELAB and MDCB and draft a specific recommendation or recommendations for discussion at the next ELAB teleconference.

COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE NELAC STANDARD

Dr. Hershey pointed out that the NELAC Quality Systems Committee has revised the blank criteria in Chapter 5, reducing the four criteria to two. He suggested that "data quality objectives" in the second of the two criteria should be changed to "method quality objectives." After minimal discussion, the issue was deemed not pressing. Mr. Parr noted that he had gotten a sense that most NELAC stakeholders are pleased with the language proposed for vote at NELAC 7. After moderate discussion it was moved, seconded, and approved unanimously that

> **ELAB endorse all proposed changes to the NELAC Standard and recommend to the NELAC community that they vote to adopt them.**

Dr. Hershey then opened the issue to discussion from the members of ELAB. In discussion of the integration of ISO 17025 into Chapter 5, ELAB noted that a straw poll conducted in the NELAC Quality Systems Committee meeting favored incorporating the ISO 17025 language verbatim rather than by reference. It was suggested that incorporating the language verbatim creates problems with copyright issues and with attempts to keep the standard current. It was also noted that U.S. EPA is paying a copyright fee for the use of ISO Guide 25 but not for ISO 17025. In response Mr. Frederic Siegelman, chair of the NELAC Quality Systems Committee, reported that participants in the straw poll had indicated that they wanted a standard consisting of one document organized like ISO 17025 and including the ISO 17025 text. In response to questions about how the ISO 17025 text would be incorporated into Chapter 5, Mr. Siegelman shared his proposed strategy. He reported that the Quality Systems Committee has created a working document that includes all of Chapter 5, ISO Guide 25, and ISO 17025 text because they anticipated having to pull some language from the document. Outdated ISO Guide 25 language will be removed as needed. Mr. Siegelman proposed putting a marker after all ISO 17025 clauses so that they can also be pulled and incorporated by reference if necessary. He then proposed selecting the most appropriate language from all the sources included in the working document to produce the best standard. Mr. Siegelman noted that he anticipates that the current appendices will remain as appendices and proposed pulling some information (e.g. PBMS) into additional appendices. In closing he asked for input from NELAC stakeholders. The issue was opened to discussion from the floor. An individual who had participated in the NELAC Quality Systems Committee's straw poll earlier in the week reported that not everyone participating in the straw poll realized that incorporation of ISO 17025 into Chapter 5 implied verbatim incorporation. She reported that she had understood the two options presented in the Quality Systems Committee meeting to be:

1. two documents - ISO 17025 integrated into Chapter 5 by reference only with no incorporation of ISO 17025 text, or
2. one document - requirements of ISO 17025 incorporated into Chapter 5, not necessarily verbatim

There was considerable discussion from the floor of proposed changes to Chapter 1 of the NELAC Standard (Program Policy and Structure). Noting that Chapter 7 (Field Activities) would not be put up

for a vote at NELAC 7, an attendee suggested that a number of proposed changes to Chapter 1 parallel Chapter 7 and should be reexamined or removed. Specific sections cited were 1.1.3 (reference to Chapter 7), 1.4.2.1 (scope of NELAC includes environmental sampling and testing), 1.8.1 (scope of accreditation to include field sampling), and 1.8.4 (section in its entirety added to be commensurate with adoption of Chapter 7). In response, Dr. Kenneth Jackson, chair of the NELAC Program Policy and Structure Committee, reported that most of these issues have been resolved. Dr. Jackson noted that section 1.8.1 would be withdrawn by the committee if Chapter 7 were not put up for a vote. He also noted that the other sections merely pertain to the Field Activities Committee's charge and do not depend upon the adoption of Chapter 7. Audience members expressed a lingering concern that a change in the scope of NELAC has not been effectively communicated to affected parties in both the regulatory community and industry. Citing Section 1.4.2.1 as an expansion of NELAC from laboratory to non-laboratory entities, an attendee asked if this expansion was authorized in the original Federal Register notice for NELAC. Ms. Jeanne Hankins, NELAP Director, noted that the Federal Register notice was not an authorization and explained that the previous FACA Committee, the Committee on National Accreditation of Environmental Laboratories (CNAEL), had been requested by U.S. EPA to include sampling. Mr. Parr noted that language reflecting the inclusion of sampling was actually proposed and adopted several years ago as the second sentence of Article 1 of the NELAC Constitution. ("The purpose of the organization is to foster the generation of environmental laboratory data of known and documented quality through the development of national performance standards for environmental laboratories and other entities directly involved in the environmental field measurement and sampling process.") Dr. Jackson further explained that it has always been the intent of the NELAC Standard to include sampling and that nothing more will happen in that regard until Chapter 7 is adopted. Many audience members noted that a significant number of data errors are sampling issues. Laboratory representatives expressed support for the language in Chapter 1.

It was generally agreed that not enough has been done to reach out to stakeholders. As a result of discussions on the issue, it was proposed that NELAC provide clarification of its intent to address non-laboratory entities through a November 2001 Federal Register notice. Ms. Hankins pointed out that NELAC is a voluntary organization separate from U.S. EPA and, therefore, cannot utilize the Federal Register mechanism. Members of ELAB suggested that ELAB recommend that both the NELAC BoD and U.S. EPA seek ways to reach out to other organizations to indicate that the scope of NELAC as defined in the NELAC Constitution includes non-laboratory organizations. After moderate discussion of this suggestion, Mr. Parr and Dr. Verstuyft indicated that they would wordsmith the language of the formal recommendation and the issue was deferred to ELAB's next teleconference.

POLICY ON ACCELERATED IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NELAC STANDARD

At Dr. Hershey's request Ms. Hankins reviewed the NELAC policy on accelerated implementation of the NELAC Standard. She reported that copies of the policy on implementation would be provided at the NELAC 7 voting session and explained that the policy stipulates that every current NELAP accrediting authority must be capable of meeting the requirement of the standard for immediate implementation. She agreed that an implementation date should be included on the document. Ms. Hankins reviewed the process for implementing a new standard. The first step in the process is preparation of an amendment to the standard that affects the approved standards from the previous two

years. The second step in the process consists of posting a notification on the NELAC Website with a spatial link to the standards. The final step consists of written notification to the NELAP accrediting authorities who will cascade the notification down to their laboratories. There was considerable discussion from the floor on implementation policy. A representative from the state of Florida reviewed his state's current regulatory timetable, noting that any standard applicable to laboratories is adopted by rule and that his state will never be able to implement a new standard "immediately." He pointed out that the effective date of the NELAC Standard in a state's administrative code may vary from accrediting authority to accrediting authority. Several attendees suggested alternate formats to highlight the portions of the standard proposed for accelerated implementation.

STRATEGIC VISION FOR ELAB

Mr. Peter Spath and Dr. Billets reviewed recent discussions with representatives from other U.S. EPA-sponsored federal advisory committees. As a result of that meeting ELAB set aside time in their April 24, 2001 meeting to discuss the strategic vision for ELAB. Dr. Billets reported that there is a renewed effort from U.S. EPA to improve communication between FACA committees. He noted that the time, synchronous with the rechartering of ELAB and the first NELAP accreditation of laboratories, seems appropriate to address strategic vision for ELAB. U.S. EPA is committed to work to improve understanding of the role of the federal advisory committee in U.S. EPA and of how the advisory committee impacts the agency. U.S. EPA will also attempt to increase the impact of the federal advisory committee on the agency. In return each federal advisory committee must initiate and discuss the activities of the committee itself. Dr. Billets noted that the issue will be further discussed in ELAB's next meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Parr informed ELAB and the audience that he is forming a 501 (c) (3) nonprofit organization to assist NELAC with administrative issues. To that end he has drawn up articles of incorporation to be filed in the coming week and draft by-laws. He has also assembled a Board of Directors. In response to a question from the floor, Mr. Parr reported that he would serve as chair of the organization and that he would report to its Board of Directors.

OPEN FORUM ISSUES

With little time remaining in their allotted meeting time, the members of ELAB briefly reviewed issues raised at the Open Forum held on May 22, 2001. The issues and their disposition is summarized below:

1. Proposed changes to NELAC Standard may greatly impact data quality.
    - Change to "technology" should include various sample prep procedures
    - Pay attention to interchange between Chapters 1, 2, and 5 with regard to laboratory control samples (LCS), spiking analytes, PTs for analytes, etc.

- "Record-keeping" requirement of Chapter 5 requires laboratories to keep records but not to do anything with them
- Proper use of initial demonstration of capability

This issue was deferred for discussion in ELAB's next teleconference.

2. PT Issues - PT programs as established seem to lack direction.

Noting extensive discussion on this issue in this meeting, ELAB deemed the issue complete.

3. Clarification of effective implementation date of approved NELAC Standard
   - For future issues
   - For 1999, 2000 approved standards

Noting that Ms. Hankins had presented the policy on implementation in this meeting, ELAB deemed the issue complete.

4. Impact of ISO 17025 revisions on NELAC Standard (especially Chapter 5)

Noting extensive discussion on this issue in this meeting, ELAB deemed the issue complete.

5. DOT/Shipping issues (pH) still a concern - commenter asked for update

Noting that Mr. Friedman had given an update during the Open Forum, ELAB deemed the issue complete.

6. Consistency issues based on interpretation of methods; "Local Interpretations" of procedure-specific implementation (e.g. t_0 for sample initiation, especially in the case of composite samples) *Is this a NELAC issue or an agency issue?*

This issue was deferred for discussion in ELAB's next teleconference.

CONCLUSION

Members of U.S. EPA-sponsored advisory committees established under FACA are appointed for two-year terms and may serve no longer than six years. It was noted that Dr. Hershey and Mr. Verstuyft are departing ELAB after six years of service. On behalf of ELAB Dr. Verstuyft saluted Dr. Hershey for his service to ELAB and his impact on NELAP over the past six years. In response Dr. Hershey recognized all the members of ELAB and its subcommittees for their hard work over the past six years. On behalf of U.S. EPA Ms. Hankins presented both Dr. Hershey and Dr. Verstuyft with letters of thanks from Dr. John Lyon of U.S. EPA's National Environmental Research Laboratory

(NERL) in Las Vegas. There being no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned by Dr. Billets shortly before 5:00 p.m. MDT. ELAB's next meeting will be held on June 27, 2001 via teleconference.

Attachment A

ACTION ITEMS
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD
MAY 24, 2001

Item No.	Action	Date to be Completed
1.	ELAB will recommend that NELAC establish a policy as to when it will develop standards for new testing areas such as source emissions, field sampling, etc. That policy should specify the number of requests necessary from federal agencies or accrediting authorities so that committees have a clear mandate to develop new standards.	Completed (NELAC 7)
2.	ELAB will consider the following suggestions offered at NELAC 7 regarding PT issues: 1. ELAB could make recommendation that a uniform scope of accreditation (especially for NELAC laboratories) be implemented as soon as possible. 2. ELAB could make recommendation that non-NELAC states review NELAC PT program before developing their own programs. 3. ELAB could encourage states to set only PT requirements rather than a fixed timeframe for PT sample analysis	June 27, 2001
3.	ELAB will consider recommendation to NELAC committees to remove the phrase "performance based measurement system" and the acronym "PBMS" from their chapters.	June 27, 2001
4.	ELAB will recommend that NELAC delay adoption of accreditation standards for stack testing for two years. ELAB recognizes the Field Activities Committee's concern for the quality of source testing and reporting data. In lieu of accreditation under the NELAC process, the states and U.S. EPA are, of course, free to promulgate regulations as they deem appropriate.	Completed (NELAC 7)
5.	ELAB will recommend that ASETT and the Measurement of Source Emissions (MSE) Subcommittee be disbanded as subcommittees of ELAB and the NELAC Field Activities Committee, respectively.	Completed (NELAC 7)
6.	ELAB will consider establishing liaison relationship with MDCB. (Jerry Parr, Bart Simmons)	June 27, 2001

ACTION ITEMS (CONTINUED)
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD
MAY 24, 2001

Item No.	Action	Date to be Completed
7.	ELAB will consider endorsement of MDCB position paper recommendations. (Jerry Parr to customize specific issues of overlap between ELAB and MDCB and draft specific recommendation(s) for discussion at future ELAB meeting)	June 27, 2001
8.	ELAB will endorse all proposed changes to the NELAC Standard and recommend to the NELAC community that they vote to adopt them.	Complete (NELAC 7)
9.	ELAB will consider recommendation that NELAC BoD and U.S. EPA seek ways to reach out to other organizations to indicate that the scope of NELAC as defined in the NELAC Constitution includes non-laboratory organizations. (Jerry Parr and Allen Verstuyft to draft specific recommendation for discussion at future ELAB meeting)	June 27, 2001
10.	ELAB will include strategic vision on its agenda for upcoming meeting(s).	June 27, 2001

ACTION ITEMS (CONTINUED)
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD
MAY 24, 2001

Item No.	Action	Date to be Completed
11.	ELAB will include the following issues, raised at the May 22, 2001 ELAB Open Forum, on its agenda for upcoming meeting(s): 1. Proposed changes to NELAC Standard may greatly impact data quality. • Change to "technology" should include various sample prep procedures • Pay attention to interchange between Chapters 1, 2, and 5 with regard to laboratory control samples (LCS), spiking analytes, PTs for analytes, etc. • "Record-keeping" requirement of Chapter 5 requires laboratories to keep records but not to do anything with them • Proper use of initial demonstration of capability 2. Consistency issues based on interpretation of methods; "Local Interpretations" of procedure-specific implementation (e.g. t_0 for sample initiation, especially in the case of composite samples) *Is this a NELAC issue or an agency issue?*	June 27, 2001
12.	ELAB will meet via teleconference.	June 27, 2001

Attachment B

PARTICIPANTS
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD
MAY 24, 2001

Name	Affiliation	Address
Hershey, J. Wilson Chair	Lancaster Laboratories, Inc.	T: (717) 656 - 2300 F: (717) 656 - 0450 E: jwhershey@lancasterlabs.com
Bigmeat, John	ECBI Tribal Utilities	T: (828) 497-3005 F: (828) 497-3268 E: johnbigm@dnet.net
Billets, Stephen, DFO	USEPA/ORD	T: (702) 798-2232 F: (702) 798-2261 E: billets.stephen@epa.gov
English, Zonetta	Louisville Jefferson Co., MSD	T: (502) 540-6706 F: (502) 540-6779 E: english@msdlouky.org
Gearhart, Harry	Dupont	T: (405) 372-7575 F: (405) 372-4828 E: harry.l.gearhart@usa.dupont.com
Hull, Connie	Kansas City Water Services Lab	T: (816) 513-7000 F: (816) 513-7001 E: connie_hull@kcmo.org
LeMoine, Elaine (absent)	PerkinElmer Instruments	T: (203) 761-2771 F: (203) 761-2887 E: lemoinea@perkinelmer.com
Marcus, Mark	Fluor Hanford/Analytical Services Program	T: (509) 373-3026 F: (509) 372-0456 E: mark_f_marcus@rl.gov
McClure, David	ART Instruments, Inc.	T: (541) 472-0190 F: (541) 472-0196 E: dmcclure@artinstruments.com
Parr, Jerry	Catalyst Info. Resources, L.L.C.	T: (303) 670-7823 F: (303) 670-2964 E: catalyst@eazy.net
Peel, Tom	Geosyntec	T: (561) 995-0900 F: (561) 995-0925 E: tomp@geosyntec.com
Spath, Peter	Eastman Kodak Company	T: (716) 588-0801 F: (716) 722-4406 E: peter.spath@kodak.com
Verstuyft, Allen	Chevron Research and Technology	T: (510) 242-3403 F: (510) 242-1792 E: awve@chevron.com

Attachment B

PARTICIPANTS (CONTINUED)
ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY ADVISORY BOARD
MAY 24, 2001

Name	Affiliation	Address
Greene, Lisa (Contractor Support)	Research Triangle Institute	T: (919) 541-7483 F: (919) 541-7386 E: lcg@rti.org
Tatsch, Gene (Contractor Support)	Research Triangle Institute	T: (919) 541-6930 F: (828) 628-0659 E: cet@rti.org

Attachment C

Environmental Laboratory Advisory Board (ELAB) Meeting

Thursday, May 24, 2001
2:00 – 5:00 p.m. (MDT)
Salt Lake City, Utah

AGENDA

1. Review minutes, action items

2. Present recent recommendations

3. PT report

4. Subcommittee reports as appropriate

5. Consider endorsement of MDCB recommendations (Jerry Parr)

6. Quality Systems PBMS Summary (Harry Gearhart)

7. Comments on standards being put forward for a vote at NELAC VII

8. Strategic vision for ELAB (Steve Billets, Peter Spath)

9. Open forum issues as time permits

10. Other business